



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VALERIUS ANTIAS AND LIVY

BY ALBERT A. HOWARD

HOPELESS as the task may appear of attempting to say anything new on this much discussed subject, it has nevertheless seemed to me not over presumptuous to review the evidence on which is based the ever-recurring¹ statement that Livy's great work is largely composed of extracts from Valerius Antias, whom Livy blindly followed in the earlier part of his history and later with greater caution, having become convinced of his untrustworthiness. We are even told that Livy practically made use of the work of Antias as a framework or skeleton on which to construct his history, and one writer, Soltau,² has gone so far as to indicate by chapter and section the portions of Livy in the first and third decades of his work which are drawn from Antias.

What we actually know about Antias and his history is derived from the fact that he is mentioned some seventy times in extant Greek and Latin writers, nine times for grammatical peculiarities, and the remaining times as authority for historical or legendary statements. Rarely are his exact words quoted, and, as occasionally two or more of the references in authors are to the same event, all have been combined into sixty-five so-called fragments by H. Peter, *Veterum Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, Leipzig, 1870, pp. 237-276.

From these fragments we learn that the work of Valerius Antias comprised at least seventy-five books, and that Numa Pompilius was treated in the second book (cf. Fragments 5, 6, 8); that events of the year 136 B.C. were mentioned in the twenty-second book (cf. Fragment 57); and that the heirs of L. Crassus, the orator, who died in 91 B.C., are mentioned in the history, though in which book we are not told (cf. Fragment 64). It is also possible to arrange chronologically the greater

¹ Teuffel-Schwabe, *Römische Literatur*, 155, 3. Schanz, *Römische Litteraturgeschichte*, 325.

² W. Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk*, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 207-9.

number of the remaining fragments, but impossible to assign them to definite books. We also know from numerous statements of Livy (cf. p. 182) that Antias was prone to exaggeration, particularly in stating numbers, a fault which is however by no means confined to his history. It is generally assumed that Livy is indebted to Antias for the exaggerated statements of numbers in his first decade, but, in fact, Livy mentions Antias only twice in the first decade: once in 3, 5, 12, where he shows an utter lack of confidence in his numbers, and again in 4, 23, 2, where he quotes Antias and Tubero as naming for the year 434 B.C. different consuls from those named by Licinius Macer, himself stating the impossibility of determining the facts. The instances cited by Teuffel-Schwabe, 155, 3 (Livy 7, 36, 13; 9, 27, 14; 9, 37, 11; 9, 43, 17), in which Livy is quoted as depending on Antias, are absolutely without authority; Antias is not mentioned in any one of them, and there is no actual evidence that he ever used the numbers thus assigned to him, or that he even wrote about the events in question. Merely because large numbers are mentioned it is assumed that they must have been taken from Antias.

It would, of course, be absurd to deny that Livy made use of the history of Valerius, which was undoubtedly the best known and most popular history of Rome until that of Livy supplanted it, but, as I hope to show, the evidence that Livy was deceived by its extravagant statements to such an extent that he slavishly copied exorbitant numbers and absurd tales, until finally he discovered that Antias was not to be trusted, is simply non-existent, while the evidence that Livy used the works of Antias with caution and did not regard his history as an accurate source of information unless its statements were corroborated by other historians, is to be found in nearly every one of the so-called fragments of Antias when compared with the corresponding portions of Livy.

As to the dependence of Livy on Antias in the first ten books of his history the following facts may be adduced: the first twenty fragments of Antias in the edition of Peter relate to events falling within the period treated by Livy in the first decade. The first fragment, drawn from Gellius 7, 7, 1, attributes to Antias the statement that Acca Larentia left to Romulus by will her property, whereas Livy does not even record the fact that she made a will. The second fragment is

from Dionysius 2, 13, and explains the name *Celeres* as derived from the name of the leader of the body-guard of the king. Livy has made no attempt to account for this name. The third fragment, derived from Plutarch, *Romulus* 14, gives the number of the Sabine women who were seized by the Romans as 527. Livy does not attempt to give any number, but in 1, 13, 6, when stating that the *curiae* received their names from the Sabine women who were captured, he assumes that the number must have been somewhat greater than thirty.

The fourth fragment, from Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1, 4, 7, reports Julius Modestus as authority for the statement that Antias names Numa as the founder of the *Agonalia*; the fifth, from Macrobius 1, 13, 20, states that Numa invented intercalation for religious reasons, neither of which reports is even referred to by Livy. In the sixth fragment, from Arnobius 5, 1, is contained the account of Numa's successful attempt to get from the gods the knowledge of the rites to be used in allaying the evil effects of lightning, a story which is also told with no variations by Plutarch in the life of *Numa* 15, 3 ff., though without mentioning Antias as the source. This story is not even alluded to by Livy, though that it was current in his time is shown by the fact that it is found, almost without change, in Ovid's *Fasti* 3, 285-348.

The seventh fragment, from Plutarch, *Numa* 22, the eighth and the fifteenth, from Pliny, *N. H.* 13, 87, and the ninth, from Livy 40, 29, 8, deal with the story of the finding of the stone chests, one of which contained the books of Numa. According to Plutarch, Valerius Antias writes that the books which were buried in the chest were twelve volumes of holy writ and twelve others of Greek philosophy, and that about four hundred years afterwards, when P. Cornelius and M. Baebius were consuls, in a time of heavy rains, a violent torrent washed away the earth, and dislodged the chests of stone; and their covers falling off, one of them was found wholly empty, without the least relic of any human body; in the other were the books, which the praetor Petilius having read and perused, made oath in the senate that, in his opinion, it was not fit for their contents to be made public; whereupon the volumes were all carried to the Comitium and there burned. Pliny also quotes Antias as stating that there were twelve books in Latin and twelve of Greek philosophy. Livy states that Antias says of the Greek books *Pythagoricos fuisse, vulgatae opinioni, qua creditur Pythagorae*

audito rem fuisse Numam, mendacio probabili adcommodata fide. Livy's own account of the finding of these chests (40, 29) differs from that of Antias in the following details: the chests were unearthed by laborers who were tilling a field; the owner of the field uncovered them; there were seven books in Latin and seven in Greek; the books were read by a number of people and became pretty well known before the praetor read them; the Greek books did not contain any Pythagorean doctrine and could not, for, as Livy had already shown (1, 18, 2), Pythagoras lived more than one hundred years later than Numa. There are a good many other details in the account of Livy which may or may not have come from Antias, but every detail found in the account of Antias is discredited by Livy.

The tenth fragment, from Valerius Maximus, *de praenom.* 4, states that the name Ancus was due to the fact that Ancus had a deformed elbow, which in Greek is called ἀγκών; Livy is silent on this point.

The eleventh fragment, from Pliny, *N. H.* 3, 70, states that when the Latin town Apiolae was captured by Tarquin he began the Capitol with the proceeds of the booty. Livy 1, 35, 7, says that the booty of this town was used for *ludi opulentiùs instructiusque quam priores reges fecerant.*

The twelfth fragment, from Plutarch, *de fortuna Rom.* 10, gives an extensive account of the miracles attending the birth of Servius Tullius, attributing his paternity to Vulcan or to the Lar familiaris, and, at variance with all other accounts, assigns the miracle of the fire playing about his head to a later period of his life when he was grieving for the death of his wife Getania. Livy and all the other writers refer this miracle to his infancy. Livy says nothing about the other miracles attending his birth and does not mention Oeresia or Getania, who appear in Antias as mother and wife respectively of Servius.

The derivation of the name Capitolium (caput Oli) of the thirteenth fragment, from Arnobius 6, 7, which is found in several other Roman writers, is not known to Livy or, at least, not thought worthy of mention by him, although he does tell of the finding of the head during the excavations for the foundations of the Capitol and of the prophecies relating to this discovery.

Two short fragments, the fourteenth, from Charisius 2, p. 208 *K*, and the sixteenth, from Priscian 7, p. 347 *H*, preserve the actual words of

Antias, but as they merely note peculiarities of grammar and can not be connected with any known historical event, they are of no value for this investigation.

The seventeenth fragment, from Asconius (p. 12, of Kiessling's edition), tells of the building, at public expense, of a house on the Capitol for Valerius Maximus, said by Plutarch, *Publicola* 20, who repeats this story, to have been the brother of Publicola. There are various opinions even in antiquity as to the person for whom this house, with its doors opening outward, was built, but Livy does not mention the matter, possibly because he had read in the oration of Cicero which Asconius annotated, in *Pisonem* 52, the statement that Cicero's house was the first one built at public expense by order of the senate for anyone.

It is also interesting to note that this is the only mention of a Valerius or reference to the existence of one in any fragment of Antias, particularly so in view of the fact that it is generally assumed and stated in modern writings about him that his work was practically a glorification of the Valerian gens, and that Plutarch drew nearly all the details of his *Publicola* from the history of Antias, whom, however, he neglects to mention either in the life itself or in the comparison of Themistocles and Publicola; a remarkable oversight under the circumstances, since even an ancient writer ought to be credited with a minimum of literary honor. As I do not wish to be misunderstood, I will say at this point that I consider it highly probable that Antias did dwell upon the glories of the Valerian gens in his history; there is, however, not the slightest evidence that he did so.

The eighteenth fragment, from Censorinus, *de die natali* 17, 8, states, on the authority of Antias, Varro, and other historians, that the *ludi saeculares* were celebrated every one hundredth year, and in 17, 9, Censorinus attributes to Livy 136 the statement that *ludi saeculares* were celebrated *centesimo quoque anno*. It does not necessarily follow that Livy drew his information from Antias, for this statement is connected with the account of the celebration of the games in the time of Augustus, games which Livy must have personally witnessed, and, as he must also have heard something about the discussion at that time as to the length of the saeculum, and have heard the famous poem of Horace which was sung on that occasion, it is hardly conceivable that he stated the length of the saeculum at one hundred years without some discus-

sion of the matter and without quoting the conflicting authorities. At any rate, we are not told that he got his information from Antias, and the obvious place from which to get it was the work of Varro, the acknowledged antiquarian authority of those times.

Fragment nineteen is from Livy 3, 5, 12, and contains a censure¹ of Antias for daring to state the number of killed and wounded in a battle between the Romans and the Aequians which was fought in the year 464 B.C.

Fragment twenty is again from Livy 4, 23, 2, and quotes Antias and Tubero as naming for the year 434 B.C. different consuls from those named by Macer. Livy himself wisely regards the facts as impossible to determine.

As we have now brought together all the positive evidence from Antias which bears upon matters treated by Livy in his first ten books, it may be worth while to stop and consider what, if anything, can be learned from it as to Livy's dependence on Antias in writing this portion of his history.² The material is, of course, very scanty, less than five pages of fragments, loosely quoted merely for their general contents, on which to base a judgment as to more than five hundred pages of Livy, but what evidence there is all points in one direction. Livy, who is

¹ As Livy in this his first mention of Antias shows the same pronounced incredulity which is exhibited in the later portions of his history, it would seem necessary for those who believe that he followed Antias blindly in the earlier portions of the work and afterwards detected his error, to admit that the error was detected at this point, in which case the influence of Antias is hardly worth considering. After stating that the events under consideration are so remote that it is difficult to give, with any hope of being believed, the numbers of those who fought or were slain, Livy holds Antias up to ridicule not merely for daring to quote numbers, but particularly for trying to make them seem credible by making them exact, and for giving, instead of round four thousand killed, four thousand two hundred and thirty.

² I have purposely omitted a discussion of the numerous passages of Livy, which are said by Soltau and others to be drawn from Antias. The only solid basis for such discussion is the fragments which are assigned to Antias, not by the conjecture of modern scholars, but by the direct statement of some ancient author, and it is only on condition that a considerable number of the preserved fragments of Antias show a close resemblance to Livy's statements that we are justified in assuming that Livy drew from Antias in other places where we have no evidence but conjecture for such assumption.

supposed to have depended on Antias for so much of his information, and particularly in these very books, has not a single statement which can be shown to have been taken from Antias; he often ignores fanciful tales and etymologies which are found in the fragments of Antias, but never by any chance agrees with him. The argument that Livy made free use of Antias and mentioned him only in case of disagreement is absolutely without foundation, for we have seen fourteen specific instances in which, although Livy does not mention him, he nevertheless disagrees with his statements as known to us from other sources, or absolutely disregards them, while there is no case of even approximate agreement. But, as has already been said, this is all the positive evidence on which to base an assertion, and it all confutes the accepted theory. It will not help matters to say that Livy got his material at second hand, for, with the exception of Dionysius, who was a contemporary of Livy, not a single writer from whom he could have drawn even mentions Antias in his preserved writings or fragments, and Dionysius mentions him but twice, once in an enumeration of the historians whose works were esteemed at Rome and once as authority for the derivation of the name Celeres. Even in case of agreement as to facts it is not safe to assume that either Dionysius or Livy copied from Antias unless it is expressly so stated. The earlier Annalists undoubtedly told many of the legends and stories which are attributed to Antias, and Antias himself did not invent all of his stories, but drew them from popular tradition or from the other Annalists, sources which were equally accessible to Dionysius and Livy.

Is it rank heresy to suppose that Livy was not under the necessity of copying from a book every idea or statement of fact in his history? Is not, on the contrary, conceivable that he was familiar with most of the legends and, perhaps also, with many of the facts of Roman history from having heard them constantly repeated in school and in public speeches, just as we are familiar with the stories about George Washington and the battles of American history, and even in writing a popular history should draw largely on an accumulated store of uncopyrighted knowledge, never thinking of referring to a book or other authority for information? Livy undoubtedly had read the work of Antias and probably often consulted it while writing his history, but he was

obviously sceptical about many statements in it and did not blindly follow when in doubt.

Furthermore, the two histories differ to such an extent in the space accorded to the various events that it is inconceivable that Livy constructed his work on the ground-plan furnished by Antias. We know almost nothing about the ground-plan of the history of Antias, but what we do know is significant. At the beginning of his third book Antias is still writing about Numa (cf. Frag. 15), whereas Livy finished his account of Numa with the twenty-first chapter of the first book, and begins his third book with the events of the year 467 B.C. Events of the year 136 B.C. are recounted by Antias in book 22 (Gellius 6, 9, 12), but by Livy in book 55 (cf. Periocha), which shows that Livy passed rapidly over the legendary history of Rome in accordance with his plan announced in his preface, but when he came to the authentic history wrote at much greater length than did Antias. He can not therefore have depended for his outline on Antias. The actual framework on which Livy constructed his history, namely, the years of the state, is so obvious that it seems almost insolent to charge him with the necessity of borrowing it from anyone. The very name, Annalist, implies this method of procedure, and practically every historian of Rome either before or after Livy followed this plan.

In the remaining fragments of Antias the same lack of agreement with the corresponding portions of Livy may be observed, but thirty of the forty-five fragments are taken from Livy, and seven of the remaining fifteen are quotations of grammatical peculiarities, which either can not be connected with known historical events or contain so little matter that no inference can be drawn from them.

In fragment twenty-one, from Gellius 3, 8, is preserved an account of the proposal made to Fabricius by Timochares to poison Pyrrhus. When the facts were laid before the senate by Fabricius we are told that the senate sent ambassadors to Pyrrhus instructing them not to betray Timochares, but to warn Pyrrhus to be on his guard against his immediate attendants. The corresponding portion of Livy is lost, but in the Periocha to book 13 the story is given as follows: *Cum C. Fabricio consuli is, qui ad eum a Pyrrho transfugerat, polliceretur, venenum se regi daturum, cum indicio ad regem remissus est*, a story

differing in its most essential features from that of Antias.¹ In 24, 45, 3, and in 42, 47, 6, Livy is obviously referring to the account which he has already given, and, if in 39, 51, 11, he refers to the other account, it is clearly not because he adopts it, but because it makes a more specious argument in the mouth of king Prusias. It is not, however, absolutely necessary to assume that Livy is here giving the version of Antias.

In the twenty-second fragment, from Censorinus 17, 10, we learn that Antias and Livy agree as to the date of the third ludi saeculares, which, however, does not necessarily imply that Livy got his information from Antias.

In the twenty-third fragment, from Livy 25, 39, 14, after a long account of the storming of two Carthaginian camps by Lucius Marcius, including the statement of Claudius that thirty-seven thousand were killed and one thousand eight hundred and thirty captured, Livy adds that Antias says only one camp, that of Mago, was stormed with a loss of seven thousand men, while in another battle with Hasdrubal, in a rush from the camp ten thousand were killed and four thousand three hundred and thirty taken prisoners, after which follows: *verae gloriae eius etiam miracula addunt, flammam ei contionanti fusam e capite sine ipsius sensu cum magno pavore circumstantium militum*, a story which is attributed to Antias by Pliny, *N. H.* 2, 241. The words *verae gloriae* show clearly how little credence Livy placed in this legend.

Fragment twenty-four, from Livy 26, 49, 1, is a long list of conflicting statements about the details of the capture of New Carthage. Included in it are two statements by Antias, one to the effect that, whereas Silenus, a Greek historian, gives the number of captured *scorpiones* large and small as sixty, Antias reports six thousand large and thirteen thousand small. Livy's comment is: *adeo nullus mentiendi modus est*. The other statement is that Arines was in command of the Carthaginian garrison and was surrendered to the Romans, whereas Livy gives the name of the commander as Mago (cf. Chap. 46).

¹ Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, II, p. 500, note, argues that Valerius Maximus 6, 5, 1, who gives the story as told by Antias, must have taken it from Livy, though why he could not get it directly from Antias, whose work was certainly used by Pliny in his *Natural History* and by Gellius, is not conspicuously evident.

In fragment twenty-five, from Gellius 7, 8, 6, Antias is quoted as sole authority for the statement that Scipio, instead of returning the beautiful Spanish captive to her father, kept her as his mistress. Livy 26, 50, not only gives the traditional account, but does not even hint at any other version of the story, although he mentions Antias twice in the next preceding chapter.

Fragment twenty-six, from Livy 28, 46, 14, contains conflicting statements as to the lading of some eighty Carthaginian ships of burden captured near Sardinia by Gnaeus Octavius. Coelius says that they were laden with grain and supplies for Hannibal, Antias that they were bearing to Carthage booty from Etruria and captive Ligurians and Montani. Livy does not attempt to decide the matter, but only mentions the conflicting reports.

In fragment twenty-seven, from Livy 29, 35, 2, after telling of two cavalry battles near the city Salaeca in each of which a general named Hanno was killed, Livy adds that not all authors are agreed on this point, and that Coelius and Antias say that Hanno was captured. He does not, however, retract his own story, and apparently only gives the other accounts in order to show his fairness.

The next two fragments are particularly significant; Livy 30, 3, 6, *Haec per nuntios acta magis equidem crediderim (et ita pars maior auctores sunt) quam ipsum Syphacem, ut Antias Valerius prodit, in castra Romana ad colloquium venisse.* Livy 30, 19, 11, *Valerius Antias quinque milia hostium caesa ait. Quae tanta res est, ut aut impudenter ficta sit aut neglegenter praetermissa. Nihil certe ultra rei in Italia ab Hannibale gestum.* Livy certainly is not putting too much faith in Antias here nor in 30, 29, 7, where he says that Antias introduces, before the battle of Zama, a battle otherwise unknown, in which Hannibal was defeated by Scipio with a loss of twelve thousand killed and seventeen hundred captured, after which, with ten other ambassadors, he came to the camp of Scipio.

In fragment thirty-one, from Livy 32, 6, 5, Antias is quoted as describing military operations of the consul P. Villius Tappulus in Epirus in 199 B.C. Villius is said to have built a bridge over the Aous, to have led his soldiers across and to have fought a battle with the enemy in which he drove them from their camp, killed twelve thousand, took twelve hundred prisoners, one hundred and thirty-two standards, and

two hundred and thirty horses. To all of which Livy says: *Ceteri Graeci Latinique auctores, quorum quidem ego legi annales, nihil memorabile a Villio actum integrumque bellum insequentem consulem T. Quinctium accepisse tradunt.* In chapter 9, 6, where Livy resumes the thread of his history, it is clear that he rejects the account of Antias.

In fragment thirty-two, from Livy 33, 10, 8, Livy, who in the preceding section, following Polybius as he himself says, has given the losses of the enemy in the battle of Cynoscephalae (197 B.C.) as eight thousand killed and five thousand captured, the Roman losses as about seven hundred killed, adds: *Si Valerio qui credat, omnium rerum inmodice numerum augenti, quadraginta milia hostium eo die sunt caesa, capta (ibi modestius mendacium est) quinque milia septingenti, signa militaria ducenta undequinquaginta.*

The thirty-third fragment is also drawn from Livy, who in 33, 30, after giving, chiefly on the authority of Polybius, the details of the peace with Philip, notes some variations and additions in the account of Antias. According to Livy the indemnity was one thousand talents, half to be paid at once and half in ten annual instalments, while Antias mentions only four thousand pounds of silver to be paid annually for ten years, and adds to the terms certain concessions which were to be made to Attalus, the Rhodians, and the Athenians. As Livy has already told of the death of Attalus in chapter 21, and can hardly have forgotten this circumstance in so short a time as would be required for writing nine chapters, it is obvious that he does not accept this part of Antias' story.

In fragment thirty-four, from Livy 33, 36, Peter has included an extended account of the operations of M. Claudius Marcellus against the Boii and the Insubres in 196 B.C., which is assumed to have been taken from Antias, because in section 13 the losses of the battle are stated as follows: *In eo proelio supra quadraginta milia hominum caesa Valerius Antias scribit, octingenta septem signa militaria capta et carpenta septingenta triginta duo et aureos torques multos, ex quibus unum magni ponderis Claudius in Capitolio Iovi donum in aede positum scribit.* It is, of course, possible and perhaps probable that Livy did draw his account from Antias, but he certainly had also one other source, Claudius, and the natural inference from the words, *id quoque inter scriptores ambigitur*, in section 15, is that he had still other sources,

and not that these words refer only to Antias and Claudius, while the fact that he quotes authority for these incredible figures might be taken as evidence of incredulity on his part. At any rate there is at most a presumption, not a proof, that Antias is the source of Livy's account.

In fragment thirty-five, from Livy 34, 10, Antias is quoted for the statement that M. Helvius, while leaving further Spain with a guard of six thousand troops, falling in with a body of twenty thousand Celtiberi, killed twelve thousand of them, took the town of Iliturgi, and put to death all the adults. Although Livy makes no comment on these figures, it certainly seems natural that a historian who tells of a battle in which the losses of the vanquished were double the number of the victors engaged in the contest, should give some authority for his statement, and it is noteworthy that Antias is here quoted merely as authority for the numbers.

In fragment thirty-six, from Livy 34, 15, 9, Antias is reported as saying that in a battle near Emporiae, fought by Cato in the year 195 B.C., forty thousand of the enemy were slain. Livy's comment is: *Cato ipse, haud sane detrectator laudum suarum, multos caesos ait, numerum non adscribit.*

In fragment thirty-seven, from Asconius in *Cic. Cornelianam* (p. 61 K.), Antias is quoted as authority for the statement that at the ludi Romani, given by the curule aediles during the second consulship of Scipio Africanus (194 B.C.), the aediles, by order of the censors, assigned to the senators seats apart from those of the people, Asconius adding: *et videtur in hac quidem oratione hunc auctorem secutus Cicero dixisse passum esse Scipionem secerni a cetero consessu spectacula senatorum. In ea autem, quam post aliquot annos habuit de haruspicum responso (24), non passum esse Scipionem, sed (ipsum) auctorem fuisse dandi eum locum senatoribus videtur significare.* The passage in Cicero further assigns this innovation to the Megalesia and not to the ludi Romani, showing conclusively that Cicero is here following a different tradition, which also appears in Valerius Maximus 2, 4, 3. Livy, who refers twice to this innovation, in both cases gives the occasion as the ludi Romani, but in 34, 44, 5, says that it was ordered by the censors, and in 34, 54, 8, gives a rumor that Scipio himself was the author of the change. In all of the accounts the same censors and the same curule aediles are named, which shows that there was no difference of

opinion as to the year. Apparently either the censors or the consuls had the authority to make the change (cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II², p. 478, note 2), but it is highly improbable that both colleges of officers had a hand in it. Whether Scipio as consul permitted the change or actually directed it, is of comparatively little importance; the event itself must have made a great stir at Rome, and have played a considerable rôle in politics, as appears from the further account in Asconius and from Livy 34, 54, 3 ff.; and while Livy may have been indebted to Antias for the whole story, he may equally well have heard it in several versions at school and in public speeches, to say nothing of the possibility of his having read it in his favorite author, Cicero, in two different versions. It seems incredible that he should have copied the story from any author. That he gives the *ludi Romani* and not the *Megalesia* as the occasion of the change may possibly be due to the greater importance of the former at the time when the change was made.

Fragment thirty-eight is from Livy 35, 2, 8. After telling of the efforts of the praetor C. Flaminius to secure a special body of picked troops for his campaign in Spain and of the refusal of the senate to grant this request, Livy says that the senate expressed its pleasure that *tumultuarii milites* should be enrolled outside of Italy for this purpose, and that Antias writes that Flaminius sailed to Sicily to hold the levy, and, sailing from there to Spain, was driven by storm to Africa, where he enlisted stragglers from the army of P. Africanus and added to these two levies a third in Spain. Livy apparently did not wish to leave unmentioned so remarkable¹ an action as this, but felt the necessity of naming the source from which his account of it was drawn.

In fragment thirty-nine Livy, who, in 36, 19, 10, has given, on the authority of Polybius, an account of the misfortunes of king Antiochus in his flight after the battle of Thermopylae, adds: *Quid si Antiati Valerio credamus sexaginta milia militum fuisse in regio exercitu scribenti, quadraginta inde milia cecidisse, supra quinque milia capta cum signis militaribus ducentis triginta? Romanorum centum quinquaginta*

¹ Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 166. Es klingt in Wirklichkeit sehr fabelhaft dass der Praetor ohne Erlaubniss des Senats in Sicilien und Africa Aushebungen anstellt und gar Soldaten aus dem Heer des Scipio Africanus, die 8 Jahre dort herumvagabondirt haben sollen, den Fahneneid schwören lässt.

in ipso certamine pugnae, ab incursu Aetolorum se tuentes non plus quinquaginta interfecti sunt.

In fragment forty, from Livy 36, 36, 4, Antias is quoted as authority for the statement that, on the completion of the temple of Magna Mater in 191 B.C., *ludi ob dedicationem eius facti, quos primos scaenicos fuisse . . . , Megalesia appellatos*, evidently because Livy 7, 2, 3, had told of the introduction of ludi scaenici in 364 B.C., and in 34, 54, 3, of their forming a part of the Megalesia in 194 B.C.

In fragment forty-one, from Livy 36, 38, 6, after quoting Antias to the effect that in a battle fought by P. Cornelius with the Boii, twenty-eight thousand of the enemy were killed, three thousand four hundred taken captive, one hundred and twenty-four standards taken, twelve hundred and thirty horses and two hundred and forty-seven wagons captured, with a loss to the victors of one thousand four hundred and eighty-four, Livy adds: *Vbi ut in numero scriptori parum fidei sit, quia in augendo eo non alius intemperatior est, magnam tamen victoriam fuisse adparet, quod et castra capta sunt et Boii post eam pugnam extemplo dediderunt sese, et quod supplicatio eius victoriae causa decreta ab senatu victimaeque maiores caesae*, facts which he apparently obtained from some more trustworthy source.

Again in fragment forty-two, Livy 37, 48, quotes from Antias a very improbable story of a rumor at Rome about the capture of L. Scipio and P. Africanus by the treachery of king Antiochus, and subsequent dire results to the Romans, showing his incredulity by adding: *Rumoris huius quia neminem alium auctorem habeo, neque adfirmata res mea opinione sit nec pro vana praetermissa.*

Fragment forty-three, from Livy 37, 60, 6, is also quoted because Antias has told a story at variance with Livy's, which Nissen, p. 201, attributes to Polybius. After describing an attempt of Q. Fabius Labeo to overawe the Cretans and induce them by mere bravado to give up the Roman and Italian captives whom they were holding as slaves, and stating that the Cretans were only slightly disturbed by this proceeding, Livy quotes the conflicting statement of Antias that four thousand captives were returned because the Cretans were frightened by the threats of war, and that this fact led to the granting by the senate of a naval triumph to Labeo.

Fragment forty-four is from Livy 38, 23, 6. Livy, having remarked the difficulty of giving trustworthy numbers of the Gallic losses in the battle of Cn. Manlius with the Gauls on Mt. Olympus in 189 B.C., adds that Claudius, who says that there were two battles on the mountain, gives the losses as forty thousand, while Valerius Antias (*qui magis immodicus in numero augendo esse solet*) says not more than ten thousand.

What is designated as fragment forty-five is the long account of the famous trial of Scipio Africanus and his brother Lucius, told by Livy in book 38, 50, 4 ff., in which Antias is twice cited as authority. As the whole history of this case has been repeatedly investigated, notably by Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, II, p. 417 ff., it will not be necessary to examine it in detail here. There is very little doubt that Livy has here taken his account from Antias, for some details of the story which are found in Livy, though not definitely ascribed by him to Antias, are so ascribed by other writers, and the whole account in Livy has the appearance of continuity and unity, but there is equally little doubt that Livy was suspicious of the trustworthiness of his authority. In chapter 55, 8, he interrupts his narrative to express his doubts of certain figures given by Antias, and proceeds in the next two chapters to tell of the mass of conflicting material with which it was necessary to deal in this portion of his history, conscientiously giving all the points as to which there were divergent statements, but without naming the conflicting authorities. It is evident that he had to consider not merely two, but many different versions, as was to be expected in the case of a tale which must have been so often told and so often referred to. He found disagreement as to the accuser, the time of the trial, and even the year in which Scipio died and the place of his burial. The speeches attributed to Scipio and Gracchus were inconsistent and of doubtful authenticity, the speech of Scipio not according even with the index or title attached to it, and although he does not say so he may have been familiar with the passages in his favorite author, Cicero, which are cited by Mommsen to disprove the genuineness of these orations. Inasmuch as Livy continues, after mentioning all of these divergencies, to tell the story as recorded by Antias, I am strongly of the opinion that his was the only continuous and in any degree consistent account of the trial,

and that Livy, wishing to include the story in his history, gave the best obtainable version of it.

Mommsen's detailed account of the trial is almost certainly the correct one, but it is highly improbable that any ancient historian gave so clear an account as he has done, and it is noteworthy that practically all of the material on which Mommsen founded his account is derived from Livy, in whose collected material every main fact is found, while only slight variations in minor details can be added from other authorities. Livy, in fact, seems to have been unable to utilize the material he had himself collected. Time enough had elapsed since the events themselves to make the popular versions mere fairy tales of no value for historical purposes, and trustworthy historical versions of the trial apparently did not exist. Livy despaired of finding a clue to the hopeless tangle and chose, though with apparent reluctance, the account of Antias, adding such conflicting details as seemed necessary to indicate his desire to tell the truth, but the impossibility of so doing.

A precisely similar state of affairs will confront the historian who attempts to write the history of the naval events of the war with Spain in 1898, and even with all the official documents before him, it will be remarkable if he does not prove himself a modern Antias or, at least, follow the account of some modern Antias.

Livy returns to the discussion of this case in 39, 52, 1, where he considers the conflicting statements about the date of the death of Scipio Africanus, who, according to Polybius and Rutilius, died in 183 B.C., according to Antias, in 187 B.C. Livy rejects both dates and gives also his reasons for so doing. The objections to the date given by Polybius and Rutilius are answered by Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, II, p. 483 ff., who accepts the date 183 B.C. Livy apparently believes that Scipio died in 185 B.C. (a date assigned to this event in Cicero, *de Senectute* 19, where Cato is represented as saying that Scipio died the year before his censorship and nine years after his first consulship), and may have followed Cicero, although he does not mention him.

Fragment forty-six, from Livy 39, 22, 8, is also closely connected with this same trial. In it, under the year 186 B.C., Livy tells of the celebration by Scipio Asiaticus of the games vowed by him during the war with Antiochus. Consistently with the account of the trial which he had drawn from Antias he now represents Scipio as impoverished

and giving the games with money contributed¹ for that purpose by kings and cities of Asia, to which country he had been sent to settle the disputes between Antiochus and Eumenes. That Livy is here following Antias is clear from his own statement and also from the fact that according to the other version of the trial Scipio Asiaticus had not yet been tried. Livy must, therefore, either reject his previous account of the trial or follow Antias here also.

In fragment forty-seven, from Livy 39, 41, 6, in commenting on the statement that the praetor Q. Naevius was detained four months at Rome to try poisoning cases, Livy expresses incredulity of the number of condemnations by saying: *Si Antiati Valerio credere libet, ad duo milia hominum damnavit.*

Fragment forty-eight, from Livy 39, 43, 1, gives the famous story of the expulsion from the senate, by Cato, of L. Quinctius Flaminius. Livy, in the preceding chapter, has told the story on the basis of the oration delivered by Cato, and charges that Antias has not read this oration, but has simply repeated an anonymous tale. Antias tells the traditional story, but makes the favorite of Flaminius a woman invited by him to a banquet. In this detail he is followed by Val. Max. 2, 9, 3, and Plutarch, *Flaminius* 18, 4, gives it as a variant version of Antias. The word *scortum* used in his account by Cicero, *de Senectute* 42, is also the word used by Cato, and there is no means of determining whether Cicero, in this detail, is following Antias or Cato. Livy certainly does not follow Antias, and, in opposition to all other accounts, says that the person executed was a Gaulish deserter and that Flaminius killed him with his own hand.

In fragment forty-nine, from Livy 39, 56, 7, the authority of Antias is quoted for the year of Hannibal's death, apparently from confusion, since Livy has already recorded the event in chapter 51, 7, and now, referring to Antias, is under the impression that Antias gives a different year from the one he has himself given. This oversight makes it evident that Livy did not use Antias as his authority for the account of Hannibal's death.

¹ Pliny, *N. H.* 33, 138, tells a similar tale about these games with the slight variation that the Roman people contribute the funds for their celebration, showing that Antias was not alone in thinking Asiaticus reduced to poverty and therefore already condemned in 186 B.C., for Pliny can not have taken his account from Antias.

In fragment fifty, Livy 41, 27, 2, quotes Antias as authority for the statement that L. Fulvius, who was expelled from the senate by the censors in 174 B.C., was not only own brother to one of the censors but also his *consors*, a statement which appears also in Velleius 1, 10, and in Valerius Maximus 2, 7, 5, perhaps in each instance from Antias. To Livy apparently the statement seems so remarkable that it deserves mention, but as Antias alone is authority for it he names him.

In fragment fifty-one, from Livy 42, 11, 1, after quoting the report of Antias that Attalus, the brother of Eumenes, came as an ambassador to Rome in the year 172 B.C., Livy adds: *Plurimum annales et quibus credidisse malis, ipsum Eumenem venisse tradunt.*

In fragment fifty-two, from Livy 44, 13, 12, are mentioned a number of details in which the account of Antias is directly opposed to that of Livy. In chapters 1 to 13 of this book is contained the history of the campaign in Greece of the year 169 B.C., and in now noting the variants introduced by Antias, who disagrees with him on nearly every point, he shows what remarkable historical originality the latter possesses. According to Nissen, p. 260, the one item of truth in the account of Antias is the statement that the Romans were suspicious of Eumenes.

In fragment fifty-three, from Livy 45, 40, 1, Antias is reported as stating the amount of gold and silver carried in the triumph of Paulus as 120,000,000 sesterces, Livy remarking that the detailed account of wagons and pounds of gold and silver mentioned by Antias himself implies a considerably larger sum than that mentioned. Velleius 1, 9, 6, gives the amount as *bis miliens centiens sestertium*, and it has been conjectured that Livy must have had a faulty copy of Antias, in which MCC was written for MMC (a surprising bit of conjectural emendation).

Fragment fifty-four, from Livy 45, 43, 8, contains the statement of Antias that 20,000,000 sesterces were derived from the Illyrian booty of Lucius Anicius in 167 B.C., with Livy's comment: *quod quia unde redigi potuerit, non apparebat, auctorem pro re posui.*

Fragment fifty-five, from Censorinus 17, 11, merely records the fact that Antias, Varro, and Livy are in accord in assigning the date of the fourth ludi saeculares. It does not, of course, follow that Livy copied from Antias, and it is natural to suppose that here, if anywhere, he consulted Varro.

In fragment fifty-six, from Orosius 5, 3, Antias is quoted as authority for a battle of the praetor Metellus in Achaia, in which twenty thousand of the Achaei and their general, Diaeus, were slain. Orosius is known to have drawn extensively on Livy for material, and may, of course, here be indebted to him, but the corresponding portion of Livy is lost, and in the Periocha to book 52, the battle with Diaeus is said to have been fought at the Isthmus and by the consul L. Mummius, while nothing is said about the death of Diaeus, nor are the losses of the Achaei stated. If the Periocha can be depended on, Livy here is not following any of the authorities mentioned by Orosius, who quotes Claudius for two battles, one at Thermopylae with Achaean loss of twenty thousand, and one in Phocis with loss of seven thousand, Valerius Antias for one battle in Achaia with loss of twenty thousand and the leader Diaeus, and Polybius for one battle in Achaia with Critolaus (loss not stated), fought by Metellus, who followed up this success by the defeat of Diaeus and the destruction of the army with which he was advancing from Arcadia. At any rate there is an utter lack of evidence that Livy followed Antias, or rather there is positive proof that he did not do so.

Of the remaining fragments but one is of any value for this investigation. Fragments fifty-seven to sixty-two and sixty-five are quoted for peculiarities of grammar and either can not be connected with any known historical event, or are incomplete sentences from which no information can be drawn. Fragment sixty-four, from Pliny, *N. H.* 34, 14, quotes from Antias the statement that the heirs of L. Crassus, the orator, sold many bronze triclinia.

Fragment sixty-three, from Orosius 5, 16, 1, gives an account of the campaign of the year 105 B.C. against the Cimbri and Teutones, and of the disgraceful defeat of the Romans at Arausio, stating the Roman losses, on the authority of Antias, as eighty thousand killed, including socii, and forty thousand sutlers and camp-followers. The Periocha to Livy 67 makes practically the same statement both as to the campaign and the losses, though if Livy accepts these figures from Antias without comment it is to be noted that this is the first occasion on which he has done so. The word *siquidem* with which Orosius introduces his quotation from Antias is wonderfully suggestive, particularly as he is believed to have taken this account from Livy and may have found that Livy had already filed this *caveat*.

We have now before us all the positive evidence existing as to the use of Antias by Livy; every statement that can be unquestionably attributed to Antias has been passed in review, and when not derived from Livy himself, compared either with the corresponding statement of Livy or with what could be learned as to his statement from the Periochae or other sources. It is, of course, almost certain that there are many more fragments of Antias concealed in Livy and in other writers, but it is only by inference that they can be identified, and there is so little unimpeachable material as a basis for such inference that it is extremely hazardous to assume with regard to any statement that it is derived from Antias. The annalists were not modern historians, and not one of them is absolutely free from the faults attributed to Antias. That any of them, even Antias, deliberately falsified history is extremely improbable, but they were nearly all strong partisans, and of two conflicting stories it was most natural for them to choose the one which was most flattering to the Romans, or even to their own political party, and, as the principle of historical writing even in the time of Quintilian was stated to be that history was closely akin to poetry and was written to tell a story, not to prove it, we may safely assume that all writers were prone to choose the account which was most interesting and which required the least work in verification. Livy cites at least a dozen annalists, presumably at first hand, for it is the almost universal opinion that he tried to tell the truth, and, therefore, to assume that any outrageously improbable tale must have been taken from a particular annalist is, in the absence of other evidence, to beg the whole question. Everything goes to show that Livy was remarkably conservative for his time, and that he accepted, in general, only such accounts as to which there was pretty fair agreement, giving his authority only in case he departed from the commonly accepted accounts or when he quoted some tale at variance with his own account.¹

¹ The view that Livy used only one source at a time, copying at length from it and occasionally referring to another source, is inconsistent with his own statements and also with all that we know about the methods of Roman writers. Statements such as: *plurium annales et quibus credidisse malis; non omnes auctores sunt; ceteri Graeci Latinique auctores, quorum quidem ego legi annales; plerique*; and many similar expressions, can not, if one believes Livy to have had any regard for the truth, be taken to mean either that Livy means one additional authority or that he only referred

For Valerius Antias, in particular, he seems to have had the greatest possible distrust, constantly dwelling on his untrustworthiness, and even where he follows him, in the story of the trial of Scipio, later introducing evidence which nullifies all that has been told on the sole authority of Antias. In all that is preserved in Livy we find an utter lack of agreement in practically every instance, and further that Livy has quoted him only to show his untrustworthiness and his own incredulity. When Censorinus states that Livy and Antias agree on the dates of the *ludi saeculares*, he nowhere says that Livy got his information from Antias, nor is there any good reason for supposing that he did, particularly in a matter of archaeology where the obvious source of information was Varro. Wherever it is possible to compare an account in Livy for which he gives no authority with the corresponding account of Antias as preserved in some other author, Greek or Roman, such divergencies are found as make it almost certain that Livy was unfamiliar with the account of Antias or ignored it, and it will be observed that nearly every statement of Antias can be thus compared. Fond, for example, as Livy was of popular etymologies, he does not mention those of Capitolium, Celeres, and Ancus which are credited to Antias, though it is hardly conceivable that they were unknown to him.

Thirty-three of the sixty-five fragments of Antias are due to mention of him by Livy, nine of the remaining fragments are quoted merely for grammatical peculiarities and can not be used for our purposes, leaving but twenty-three to be considered. In ten instances Livy has ignored the statements of Antias, in seven he has given a different account, in one instance the account as given in the *Periocha* agrees with that of Antias, in three instances relating to the *ludi saeculares* there is agreement with Antias, but also with Varro, and as to two fragments it is impossible to decide.

to these authors without having read their works. My own idea of Livy's method has already been anticipated by H. A. Sanders, in his dissertation, *Die Quellencontamination im 21. und 22. Buche des Livius*, Berlin, 1897, namely, that his work was based on a large collection of notes and excerpts which he combined as best he could into a continuous history, telling in his own language what he conceived to be the truth, and quoting divergencies from his account whenever it seemed to him important to do so. There is, of course, no positive proof that Livy worked in this manner, but as this was certainly the usual practice of his time, it is a natural assumption that he followed it.

Of the thirty-three fragments which are due to Livy six express the strongest disagreement with the statements of Antias, eleven are criticisms of exorbitant numbers coupled with such statements as: *audet tamen Antias Valerius concipere summas; adeo nullus mentiendi modus est; si Valerio qui credat omnium rerum inmodice numerum augenti; ibi modestius mendacium est*; ten are quotations of statements in Antias at variance with Livy's own statements, in three, statements are made, hesitatingly, on the sole authority of Antias, in one, two conflicting accounts are given with no opinion stated as to the merits of either, and in two, relating to the trial of Scipio, there is complete agreement, although Livy later introduces evidence which disproves his own story as taken from Antias.

It is on such evidence as this that we are asked to believe that Antias was the source of considerable portions of Livy's history and that Livy followed blindly, at least in the earlier part of his work.